

# THE FORMATION AND INFLUENCE OF THE ANTIOCHENE LITURGY

MASSEY H. SHEPHERD, JR.

# I

OLD service books are rarely preserved by those who have ceased to use them. If not worn out from constant use and thrown into the rubbish heap, they are abandoned to oblivion when revised versions appear with forms and ceremonies more congenial to new fashions of doctrine and taste. The scanty sources available to a liturgiologist comprise a meager lot when compared with the rich provisions of his fellow historian in the fields of exegesis, theology, and apologetics. The passage of time has been more generous to the sermons and the letters of the great Fathers of the Church than to their public prayers. It is noteworthy that in the invaluable inventory of early Christian literature contained in his *Church History*, Eusebius displays no interest in the worship of the several leading sees—in marked contrast to his concern for recording their episcopal successions and New Testament canon. His documents include only a single prayer of importance: the valedictory supplication of Polycarp enshrined in the account of his martyrdom.<sup>1</sup> The continuators of Eusebius exhibit almost the same indifference to liturgical custom and usage.<sup>2</sup>

There are good reasons for this circumstance. In the early centuries, liturgical compositions were matters of unwritten tradition, left largely to the immediate and extemporaneous inspiration of celebrants. If a bishop or priest had put his prayers in written form, his collection would remain unpublished among his personal *sacra privata*.<sup>3</sup> His successor was not bound to use them or preserve them. Regulations for the adoption of fixed liturgical formularies, for diocesan or provincial use, are unknown before the later years of the fourth century, and appear first in the West.<sup>4</sup> It would not have occurred to the Christians of early times, any more than to us today, to provide celebrants with stenographers and secretaries to take down their words in solemn prayers, with a view to publication, as such persons were employed to record sermons or lectures.

A more fundamental reason for reticence in liturgical composition is summed up in the custom familiarly known as *disciplina arcani*. The phrase is one invented by modern controversy, and there have been exaggerations regarding the stringency of its application by the early Fathers.<sup>5</sup> But no one who has read much of the exegetical and homiletical literature of the ancient Church has escaped the frustration offered by allusions to things not to be divulged to profane ears, to veiled mysteries known only to the faithful. We would give much to possess more writings of apologists as cautiously indiscreet as Justin

<sup>1</sup> *H.E.*, iv. 15. 33–35.

<sup>2</sup> Exceptions are Socrates, *H.E.*, v. 22, and Sozomen, *H.E.*, vii. 19.

<sup>3</sup> The earliest extant example is the fourth-century *Euchologion*, commonly called the *Sacramentary*, of Sarapion of Thmuis. See the survey of these *libelli* by E. Bourque, *Étude sur les sacramentaires romains*, I (Studi di antichità cristiana XX [Rome, 1948]), pp. 2–11.

<sup>4</sup> Enactments occur first in North Africa: Synod of Hippo (393), can. 21; XI Council of Carthage (407), can. 9. Cf. Bourque, *op. cit.*, p. 12.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. P. Batiffol, “Arcane,” *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, I, 1738–58; Bourque, *op. cit.*, p. 1.

Martyr or Tertullian, who provide even the barest outline of what was said and done behind locked doors and drawn curtains, after the unbaptized and the catechumens were dismissed from the churches' assemblies for worship.

In view of such circumstances, one may pardon the enthusiasm of liturgiologists when two eminent scholars, working independently, uncovered the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus of Rome, a work dated about the year A.D. 200.<sup>6</sup> It provided, so it would seem, the "missing link" to the students of early Christian liturgy. To a much greater extent than the discovery a generation earlier of the problematic *Didache*, the recovery of the *Apostolic Tradition* has revolutionized the science of liturgics and necessitated the rewriting of all basic manuals on the subject. It brought an end to the lingering life of theories, sustained to the end of the nineteenth century, that viewed the so-called Clementine Liturgy of the eighth book of the *Apostolic Constitutions* and the Liturgy of St. James as authentic witnesses of the worship of the apostolic Church.<sup>7</sup>

No one can seriously question the importance of the *Apostolic Tradition*. It is the only orthodox liturgy of the Christian sacraments, other than the archaic *Didache*, that we possess from the ante-Nicene period, and it derives, presumably, from the usages of no less a see than Rome. It illuminates the later stages of development of every major rite of Christendom, East and West. In particular, it is a primary source of those fourth- and fifth-century Syrian rites that an older generation considered primitive and normative. Yet, when all this is said, a warning is in order. The enthusiasm of liturgiologists for this discovery has tended to blind them to certain grave questions respecting the *Apostolic Tradition* that have received to date no definitive answer. In recent years there have been increasing signs of skepticism, regarding the actual liturgical formularies of the document, as to whether they are as old as the traditions in which they are embedded.<sup>8</sup>

It is necessary to remember that the only textual materials we possess of the *Apostolic Tradition* are translations and versions of the mid-fourth and later

<sup>6</sup> E. Schwartz, *Über die pseudoapostolischen Kirchenordnungen* (Schriften der wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft in Strassburg, 6 [1910]); R. H. Connolly, *The So-Called Egyptian Church Order and Derived Documents* (Texts and Studies VIII, 4 [Cambridge, 1916]). For the date, see C. C. Richardson, "The Date and Setting of the Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus," *Anglican Theological Review*, XXX (1948), pp. 38-44.

<sup>7</sup> F. E. Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, I (Oxford, 1896), pp. xlv, liv.

<sup>8</sup> The authenticity of the *epiclesis* in Hippolytus' Anaphora was raised by G. Dix, *The Treatise on The Apostolic Tradition of St. Hippolytus of Rome* (London, 1937), pp. 75-79. His views were contested by B. Botte, "L'épiclesse de l'anaphore d'Hippolyte," *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale*, XIV (1947), 241-51; and by C. C. Richardson, "The So-Called Epiclesis in Hippolytus," *The Harvard Theological Review*, XL (1947), pp. 101-08. A more extensive critique of the original Hippolytean character of the Anaphora has been made by E. C. Ratcliff, "The *Sanctus* and the Pattern of the Early Anaphora," *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, I (1950), pp. 29-36, 125-34. See also the discussion of the *Anamnesis* of Hippolytus' rite by W. E. Pitt, "The *Anamnesis* and Institution Narrative in the Liturgy of Apostolic Constitutions Book VIII," *ibid.*, IX (1958), pp. 1-7. The Roman origin of the initiation rites of the *Apostolic Tradition* has been seriously questioned by A. Salles, "La 'Tradition apostolique' est-elle un témoin de la liturgie romaine?" *Revue de l'histoire des religions*, CXLVIII (1955), pp. 181-213. A recent exhaustive study of J. M. Hanssens, *La liturgie d'Hippolyte*, *Orientalia christiana analecta*, 155 (Rome, 1959), concludes that the liturgy of the *Apostolic Tradition* is an "ideal" one, fundamentally Alexandrian, rather than Roman in character.

centuries. Most of these versions are encased with other reworked materials of the “church order” type, all of them bearing a pseudo-apostolic claim of origin. Of the specific sections of this material that make up the *Apostolic Tradition*, the attribution to Hippolytus rests upon two, apparently independent, notices: one, the directions concerning ordinations in the fifth-century *Epitome* of the eighth book of the *Apostolic Constitutions*; the other, the Arabic and Ethiopic versions of the so-called *Canons of Hippolytus*, which date from the sixth century. Both of these documents accept the false tradition, first attested in the late fourth century, that Hippolytus was a disciple and companion of the apostles.<sup>9</sup> Modern scholars would never have put any credence in these attributions had it not been for the listing of an “Apostolic Tradition” among the works catalogued on the base of the famous statue of Hippolytus, found in 1551 near the Via Tiburtina in Rome, and now included in the early Christian sculptures exhibited in the Lateran Museum. The identification of this statue, however, is not so certain as is commonly supposed, but it is impossible here to enter into the complicated problems of the archaeological and literary data with which modern scholars have sought to reconstruct the career of the first anti-pope of the Roman Church.<sup>10</sup>

The influence of the *Apostolic Tradition* upon the liturgical and canonical development of the churches of Egypt and Ethiopia is unquestioned. Its ritual formularies, but slightly expanded, are still in use among the Copts and Abyssinians.<sup>11</sup> Its impact upon the churches of Syria is a more delicate problem. Certainly, Syrian compilers of “church orders” in the late fourth century knew it and used it. But they adapted its regulations regarding the ministry and the celebration of the sacraments to Syrian usages.<sup>12</sup> Such adaptations are not the case, apparently, with the Latin version of the *Apostolic Tradition* made in the fourth century, and known to us from the fragments of the Verona palimpsest published by Hauler.<sup>13</sup> Hence it is difficult to affirm so confidently with Dom Gregory Dix that “there are very strong grounds for attributing a *Syrian* origin to the codex from which it was made, if not to the translator himself.”<sup>14</sup>

This much may be said: The Eucharistic Anaphora, or Consecration Prayer, in the liturgy of the *Apostolic Tradition* is of a Syrian, not an Egyptian type. If we assume that Hippolytus of Rome composed this prayer, there are two possible explanations for its form: 1. The Roman Consecration Prayer of

<sup>9</sup> For such reasons the authenticity is rejected by H. Engberding, “Das angebliche Dokument römischer Liturgie aus dem Beginn des dritten Jahrhunderts,” *Miscellanea liturgica in honorem L. Cuniberti Mohlberg*, I (Rome, 1948), pp. 47–71. *Contra*, see B. Botte, “L’authenticité de la *Tradition apostolique de saint Hippolyte*,” *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale*, XVI (1949), pp. 177–85.

<sup>10</sup> The questions raised recently by P. Nautin respecting the identity of Hippolytus have provoked sharp controversy. See the bibliography of M. Richard appended to *Patrologia Orientalis*, XXVII, 1–2 (1954), pp. 271–72; and B. Altaner, *Patrologie* (5th ed., Freiburg, 1958), pp. 146–47. One should not overlook the important contribution of A. Amore, “Note su S. Ippolito Martire,” *Rivista di archeologia cristiana*, XXX (1954), pp. 63–97.

<sup>11</sup> Dix, *op. cit.*, pp. lvii–lxvi.

<sup>12</sup> The Syrian versions, in the regulations for the ministry, insert directives for the Order of Deacons, an office unknown at Rome. With respect to their adaptations of the initiatory rite of Baptism and Confirmation, see *infra*, p. 42 ff.

<sup>13</sup> E. Hauler, *Didascaliae Apostolorum fragmenta Veronensis Latina* (Leipzig, 1900), p. 101 ff.

<sup>14</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. xlvi.

Hippolytus is ultimately derived from a Syrian prototype. As a conserver of old tradition, Hippolytus may have followed a liturgical form or outline that came to Rome from missionaries and teachers from the East, if not from Antioch itself. This theory would fit the tradition of the two chairs of Peter, the earlier at Antioch, the later at Rome. 2. The Anaphora of Hippolytus was shaped originally at Rome, and later was influential in the development of the Eastern rites, notably the Syrian. This possibility is the theory favored now by the majority of liturgiologists.<sup>15</sup> To state the theory in another way—Hippolytus' rite is viewed as the norm used throughout the Church in ancient times, a norm that survives in its purest form in the Syrian family of liturgies.

There is no way of proving either of these alternatives. And there is a third possibility of interpretation—one recently argued with great subtlety by Professor E. C. Ratcliff.<sup>16</sup> This theory posits a revision of the Hippolytean Anaphora in the fourth century, probably in Syria. Hence the text of the Anaphora in the *Apostolic Tradition*, in the form known in the versions and notably in the Latin of the Verona palimpsest, cannot be trusted to be either Hippolytean or Roman, or even of third-century date. This view of the matter is just as possible, and just as speculative, as the position more commonly accepted. Since we do not possess the original Greek text of Hippolytus, we have no assurance that the modern reconstruction from recensions and versions of the fourth and later centuries restores the original unaltered. In fact, there is enough evidence to show that adaptations and alterations were made frequently in the versions.<sup>17</sup>

In matters so highly hypothetical as the early history of the liturgy, the only sound methodology is to move from the known to the unknown. Hippolytus' *Apostolic Tradition* leaves us with too many unknowns regarding its textual history, if not its very author and place of origin. It is not safe, therefore, to adopt the orthodox procedure and describe the origin and formation of the Antiochene liturgy by using the *Apostolic Tradition* as the pivot or hinge of the whole history of its development. We can prove that this document was not normative for the Syrian rites of initiation in Baptism and Confirmation. There is no necessary reason to suppose that it was normative for the Syrian rite of the Eucharist. The liturgy of Antioch must be reconstructed from sources that are known to be Syrian and that can be dated with greater security.

## II

It is a singular misfortune that the sources are so slight for the student of any phase of the church history of the Antiochene church in the early centuries.<sup>18</sup>

<sup>15</sup> The classic treatment from this point of view is that of W. H. Frere, *The Anaphora or Great Eucharistic Prayer* (London, 1938). G. Dix severely criticized this in "Primitive Consecration Prayers," *Theology*, XXXVII (1938), pp. 261-83; but his own reconstruction is basically a variant on the same theme, in *The Shape of the Liturgy* (Westminster, 1944), especially pp. 208-37.

<sup>16</sup> *Art. cit.*, note 8 *supra*.

<sup>17</sup> The most convenient way to test this is by reference to the apparatus in Dix's edition, cited in note 8 *supra*.

<sup>18</sup> A fundamental survey is R. Devreesse, *Le Patriarcat d'Antioche depuis la paix de l'Église jusqu'à la conquête arabe* (Paris, 1945), with the detailed review of E. Honigmann, "The Patriarchate of

The materials are less sufficient than those available for its sister sees of Alexandria and Rome, who alone rivalled it in importance and influence. Outside of the few traditions in the New Testament, the historian of the Antiochene church must be content with the seven letters of Ignatius, the apology of Theophilus, a few fragments of episcopal letters preserved by Eusebius, and scraps of apocryphal and Gnostic remains. We do not have authentic, contemporary narrations of the ordeals of Antioch's two most distinguished martyrs: Ignatius and Babylas. What would we not give in exchange for some of the outrageous gossip about Paul of Samosata to possess eyewitness accounts of such singular happenings as Origen's visit to Antioch under military escort, to confer with the Empress Julia Mamaea, or the application of the Emperor Philip the Arabian to Bishop Babylas for admission to the Paschal mysteries?<sup>19</sup>

Insofar as the curtain raises for us to catch glimpses now and then, we find the see of Antioch seldom free from theological dissension. If Walter Bauer is correct, the church was overwhelmed by Gnosticism throughout the major portion of the second century.<sup>20</sup> In the third century, it was rocked by the respective partisans of Monarchianism and Origenistic trinitarianism.<sup>21</sup> The most unhappy period was the fourth century. From the Council of Nicaea to the end of the century, Antioch was rent by schism, sometimes of two, sometimes of three factions. It was incapable of exerting influence at a time when it might have counted for much.<sup>22</sup> The see had hardly recovered its unity and strength when it was humiliated by the Christological controversies set going by Nestorius. From that time onwards, its precarious unity was doomed.

One may be the more amazed, therefore, at the extent of Antioch's impress upon the churches of the East, with the principal exception of Egypt. Its achievement is doubly remarkable when one considers the ethnic and cultural diversity both of its wide "patriarchal" sphere and of its more immediate "metropolitan" supervision of Coele Syria. The Bishop of Antioch was never a pope in his patriarchate to quite the degree as were his brothers in Alexandria and Rome. His rights were not so precisely defined at Nicaea.<sup>23</sup> When, after the recovery from internal schism at the end of the fourth century, Antioch seemed in a fair position to assert a more effective patriarchal authority, it had already lost to Constantinople control over Thrace, Asia, and Pontus; and it was well on the way to losing Palestine to a new and fifth patriarchate of Jerusalem.

The proof of Antioch's leadership in the liturgical sphere is manifest,

Antioch, A Revision of Le Quien and the *Notitia Antiochena*,<sup>19</sup> *Traditio*, V (1947), pp. 135-61. Also valuable: C. Karalevskij, "Antioche," *Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastique*, III, cols. 563-703; J. Kollwitz, "Antiochia am Orontes," *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum* I, 461-9. A signal contribution is the work of G. Downey, *A History of Antioch in Syria from Seleucus to the Arab Conquest* (Princeton, 1961).

<sup>19</sup> Eusebius, *H.E.*, vi. 20. 3-4, and 34. 1; cf. Chrysostom, *In S. Babylam*, 6.

<sup>20</sup> *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzeri im ältesten Christentum* (Tübingen, 1934), pp. 67-70.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. Eusebius, *H.E.*, vii. 27-30.

<sup>22</sup> Cf. H. Lietzmann, *From Constantine to Julian* (A History of the Early Church, III [New York, 1950]), p. 126.

<sup>23</sup> See the most recent discussion by F. Dvornik, *The Idea of Apostolicity in Byzantium and the Legend of the Apostle Andrew* (Dumbarton Oaks Studies, IV (Cambridge, 1958), p. 11 ff.

nonetheless, in the actual state of the Eastern rites. All of them, with the exception of those that stem from Alexandria, are either direct descendants of the Antiochene rite, or what we may describe as "double first cousins." Even the rites of Egypt underwent extensive Syrianizing influence, either by way of the Jerusalemite or by borrowing from the Constantinopolitan cousins of the Antiochene liturgy. Furthermore, there awaits to be written a conclusive monograph on the influence of Antioch upon the Roman and Gallican rites of the West, disentangling it from those features of the Western liturgical tradition that are either "native" or derived from Egypt.<sup>24</sup> It is a relatively easy task to detect certain specific forms and features of liturgical usage that originated in Antioch and spread to many other rites, such as the litany form, the use of antiphonal psalmody, and the consecratory *Epiclesis*. But none of these can be traced with security before the fourth century.<sup>25</sup> There must have been a broader base of influence from Antioch, reaching back to ante-Nicene times, that includes the basic shape and pattern of the liturgy. Yet it is difficult to prove this from the extant remains.

The assumption of this far-reaching influence rests, of course, upon the primary fact that Antioch was the chief base of Christian missionary expansion, once the Church had broken away from its Judaean birthplace. There Peter had his first "chair."<sup>26</sup> There Paul returned again and again to report and to gain fresh resource for his Gentile mission.<sup>27</sup> There—and how proudly the church of Antioch recalled the fact—the disciples of The Way were first dissociated from Judaism and were called "Christians."<sup>28</sup> There the episcopal organization was formulated.<sup>29</sup> There the first ecclesiastical gospel—that which

<sup>24</sup> E.g., studies need to be developed and extended along lines such as U. Monneret de Villard, "Antiochia e Milano nel VI secolo," *Orientalia christiana periodica*, XII (1946), pp. 374–80.

<sup>25</sup> Litany forms are doubtless based on pre-Christian models, both Jewish and Hellenistic (see A. Baumstark, *Liturgie comparée* (3rd ed., rev. by B. Botte [Chevetogne and Paris: Éditions de Chevetogne, 1953]), p. 80 ff.); but the oldest examples of Christian liturgical litanies extant are given in the *Apostolic Constitutions* and the Antiochene sermons of Chrysostom. See texts assembled by I. M. Hanssens, *Institutiones liturgicae de ritibus orientalibus*, III (Rome, 1932), p. 234 ff.

Antiphonal psalmody was first used at Antioch by Diodore and Flavian in the time of Bishop Leontius (Theodoret *H.E.* ii. 19). The tradition known to Socrates (*H.E.* vi. 8) that the practice was introduced at Antioch by Ignatius is not generally accepted by liturgiologists. According to Augustine (*Conf.* ix. 7), St. Ambrose introduced antiphonal psalmody to the West *secundum morem orientalium partium*. See *infra*, note 62.

*Epiclesis* forms are undoubtedly ante-Nicene, though their precise origin and character are much disputed. See *infra*, note 82; and, for discussion of the *epiclesis* in Hippolytus, the references in note 8 *supra*. The principal texts are given by Hanssens, *op. cit.*, pp. 460–63.

<sup>26</sup> The basis of this tradition is undoubtedly Gal. 2:11 ff.; to which should be added the possible "Antiochene" origin of the saying to Peter in Matt. 16:18 (see *infra*, note 30). Origen (*Hom. in Luc.* vii) was the first to refer to Peter as "Bishop of Antioch," and his remark is doubtless the source of Eusebius (*H.E.* iii. 36, 2). The earliest official pronouncement of Antioch as a "see" of Peter occurs in the famous *Decretum Gelasianum*, chap. 3, which many scholars consider to derive from a Roman Synod held under Pope Damasus I in 382. For pertinent literature, see E. Caspar, *Geschichte des Papsttums* (Tübingen, 1930–33), I, pp. 598–99; II, p. 773.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Acts 13:1–3; 14:26–28; 15:35–41; 18:22–23.

<sup>28</sup> Acts 11:26. See the discussion and bibliography concerning this name by H. Karpp, "Christennamen," *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*, II (1954), pp. 1131–32, 1138; to which should be added: C. Cecchelli, "Il nome e la 'setta' dei Cristiani," *Rivista di archeologia cristiana*, XXXI (1955), pp. 55–73; H. B. Mattingly, "The Origin of the Name *Christiani*," *The Journal of Theological Studies*, N.S., IX (1958), pp. 26–37.

<sup>29</sup> The office of "Bishop" may not have originated in Antioch, but its monarchical form is first attested in the letters of Ignatius.

came to stand first in the fourfold gospel canon: the Gospel of St. Matthew—was probably written.<sup>30</sup> There the Gnostic crisis was first faced and fought.<sup>31</sup>

If we would seek, however, for the most distinctive factor in the life of the church of Antioch—that which gave to its liturgical spirit a peculiar mark—we must find it in the living encounter that it maintained with Judaism throughout the early centuries. In this respect, the church in Antioch differs in a marked degree from its sister patriarchates, for whom the problem of an ever-present pressure from Judaism was of little importance after the apostolic age. In Antioch alone, the frontier line separating Judaism and Christianity was always tense, with constant communication from one side to the other. It was there that the Semite and the Greek carried on a dialogue to which we can listen at every stage of the Church's history, when the curtain is lifted on the scene.<sup>32</sup>

It begins with the dispute in the apostolic age over the question of Judaizing, which temporarily separated Paul from Peter and Barnabas.<sup>33</sup> It underlies the sharp warnings of Ignatius against those who “talk of Jesus Christ and practice Judaism.”<sup>34</sup> The Antiochene (or Syrian) Gospel of Matthew is the most Jewish, as it is the most universalistic, in its outlook.<sup>35</sup> It is probable that the Gnosticism of Syria had a markedly Jewish element.<sup>36</sup> One of the most acute students of Theophilus of Antioch has reminded us that the theological views of this bishop-apologist were in many respects more Jewish than those of the Ebionites.<sup>37</sup> We are familiar with the disdain of the Syrian apologist Tatian for Greek philosophy—so different from the outlook of his teacher Justin Martyr.<sup>38</sup> Eusebius took special note among the writings of Bishop Serapion of a work addressed *To Domnus*, who had fallen away “from the faith in Christ to Jewish will-worship.”<sup>39</sup>

One might profitably study, too, through the later generations, the Judaistic orientation of Antiochene theologians and exegetes. Whether we consider Paul of Samosata, Lucian the martyr, or the giants of the later fourth-century school

<sup>30</sup> The Antiochene origin of Matthew, defended by B. H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels, A Study of Origins* (New York, 1925), pp. 500–27, is not universally accepted; but most critics place it in Syria, or possibly Phoenicia. Antioch, however, played a crucial role in the gospel's diffusion and acceptance. Cf. B. W. Bacon, *Studies in Matthew* (New York, 1930), p. 24 ff.

<sup>31</sup> This is suggested not only by Ignatius' letters, but by the traditions of Antiochene provenance (or activity) of so many of the early Gnostic teachers (Menander, Saturninus, Cerdö, Basilides). See Bauer, *op. cit.* (note 20 *supra*).

<sup>32</sup> The best study of Judaism at Antioch remains that of C. H. Kraeling, “The Jewish Community at Antioch,” *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LI (1932), pp. 130–60. See also S. Zeitlin, “The Names Hebrew, Jew and Israel,” *The Jewish Quarterly Review*, XLIII (1952–53), pp. 365–79.

<sup>33</sup> Gal. 2:11–14.

<sup>34</sup> Mag. 10:3; cf. also 8:1 and 9:1; Phil. 6:1.

<sup>35</sup> Streeter, *op. cit.*, pp. 500–04.

<sup>36</sup> The earliest known Gnostic teachers at Antioch stem from Simonian Gnosticism, with its roots in Samaria and connections with Jewish magic. See Bauer, *op. cit.*; G. Quispel, *Gnosis als Weltreligion* (Zürich, 1951), p. 51 ff.; H. J. Schoeps, *Urgemeinde, Judenchristentum, Gnosis* (Tübingen, 1956), p. 35 ff. Jewish elements in the teaching of the Antiochene Gnostic Saturninus have been stressed by R. M. Grant, *Gnosticism and Early Christianity* (New York, 1959), p. 99 ff.

<sup>37</sup> R. M. Grant, “The Problem of Theophilus,” *The Harvard Theological Review*, XLIII (1950), pp. 188–96.

<sup>38</sup> Cf. J. Quasten, *Patrology*, I (Westminster, 1950), pp. 220–24, for discussion and references.

<sup>39</sup> H.E., vi. 12, 1.

of Antioch—Diodore, Theodore, John Chrysostom—we find in all of them a closer adherence to Biblical literalism, with a concomitant rejection of the florid allegorical exegesis that lent itself so readily to daring speculation. It is not that these men were in any sense Judaizers. Their Hellenistic culture was a match for any Alexandrian. But they were always on their guard against Gnostic tendencies that drew Christian theology away from the concreteness of the historical into the abstractions of mythologizing and mysticism. In this we may note the strong pull upon them of the ever-continuing need of apologetics to Judaism. Chrysostom's sermons against Judaism, preached in Antioch in 386, are in this circumstance the more noteworthy for what they reveal—how at so late a time so many Christians in the city continued to be attracted to the synagogue and its rites on Jewish holy days.<sup>40</sup>

Another factor in the cultural environment of the Antiochene church that bears directly upon the development of its liturgical traditions should not be overlooked. I refer to the close proximity at all times of a relatively non-Hellenized, Syriac-speaking element of the Christian population. On several occasions Chrysostom referred to the presence in the city churches of Christian brothers from the nearby countryside who did not speak Greek. He described them as

... at one time employed in yoking the laboring oxen and guiding the plough and cutting deep the furrow; and at another ascending the sacred pulpit and cultivating the souls of those under their authority; at one time cutting away the thorns from the soil with a bill-hook, at another purging out the sins of the soul by the Word.<sup>41</sup>

Chrysostom praised their innocence of the dogmas of pagan philosophy, their insight and wisdom respecting the evangelical doctrines of the Holy Scriptures.

Antoine Wenger has suggested that these rustics, who spoke no Greek, were peasant-monks who by word and example supervised both the manual labor and the Christian worship of the serfs on their proprietary lands.<sup>42</sup> Whether monks or not, these country lay-preachers and farmers are by no means insignificant witnesses to the existing tradition of a native Syriac Christian worship contiguous with and in sympathetic relation to the cultured Greek liturgical usages of the great city itself. If this were true of Antioch, how much more would it apply to the hinterland of Syria and beyond? The answer to this question can be laid bare in a cursory analysis of the liturgical sources of Syria such as remain to the present day.

### III

The earliest liturgical source that we possess from the church in Syria is the *Didache*, discovered by Bryennios in 1875 in the Patriarchal Library of Jeru-

<sup>40</sup> The background of these sermons has been acutely studied by M. Simon, "La polémique anti-juive de S. Jean Chrysostome et le mouvement judaïsant d'Antioche," *Mélanges Franz Cumont: Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire Orientales et Slaves*, IV (1936), pp. 403-21.

<sup>41</sup> *Ad populum Antiochenum* ("On the Statues"), xix. 2.

<sup>42</sup> Jean Chrysostome, *Huit catéchèses baptismales inédites*, Sources chrétiennes, 50 (Paris, 1957), pp. 60-62.

salem at Constantinople. The literary and historical problems of this document continue to be occasion of sharp disagreement among scholars.<sup>43</sup> The Greek recension that we have was probably made in Egypt towards the middle of the second century; for the editor of the *Didache* has expanded his sources with scriptural citations that include both the pseudo-Epistle of Barnabas and the *Shepherd* of Hermas. It was only in Egypt that these two works enjoyed canonical authority;<sup>44</sup> and, if we may judge from the surviving literature of the ancient Church, it was only in Egypt that the *Didache* itself was received with a quas/scriptural respect and exercised direct influence upon later liturgical and “church-order” formulations. It does not appear to have had the same or comparable impact in Syria. The *Didascalia* of the third century made no use of it, and the fourth-century compiler of the *Apostolic Constitutions* worked from a text that contained the interpolations or revisions made by its Egyptian editor.

We must still reckon, nonetheless, with the “church-order” material of the *Didache*, which formed one of the basic sources used by the compiler in Egypt. For it is generally admitted that the liturgical directions and formularies were of Syrian provenance, and may be dated possibly as early as the latter decades of the first century. We cannot argue here the disputed question whether the *Didache* differentiated as yet the sacramental Eucharist from the non-sacramental Agape supper.<sup>45</sup> I am inclined to believe that it did. What is germane to our purpose is to note that the forms of the table prayers of blessing are unmistakable versions, with Christian content, of Jewish benedictions. They have the same structure as the Jewish *beracha*: the opening address of blessing to God, the relative *anamnesis* clause reciting the works of God, and the concluding doxology.<sup>46</sup> The vocabulary of the blessings, however, exhibits a strongly Hellenized cast, despite the eschatological orientation, in such words as “knowledge,” “faith,” “immortality,” and “eternal life.” It is not necessary to see here any direct influence, as some have maintained, from the Gospel of John. What we have in the *Didache* prayers is a phenomenon parallel to that of the Fourth Gospel: a Semitic form and structure into which have been infused religious concepts and words from a Hellenistic, albeit Christianized, realm of thought and experience.

An excellent illustration of this phenomenon is afforded by the collection of Hellenistic-Jewish synagogue prayers appended to the seventh book of the *Apostolic Constitutions*. The slight retouches and modifications made in these prayers by a Christian hand are easily recognized. They are essentially, as Kohler showed over a generation ago,<sup>47</sup> Hellenized versions for a Greek-

<sup>43</sup> The most recent survey of all the literature is J. P. Audet, *La Didachè, Instructions des apôtres*, Études bibliques (Paris, 1958). I cannot agree, however, with the author's own solutions as to date and literary development.

<sup>44</sup> For the date and provenance of the *Didache*, I adopt the views of C. C. Richardson (ed.), *Early Christian Fathers*, The Library of Christian Classics, I (Philadelphia, 1953), pp. 162–63.

<sup>45</sup> Literature in Quasten, *op. cit.*, p. 39, and Richardson, *op. cit.*, pp. 168–70. See also the extensive discussions in Audet, *op. cit.*, p. 372 ff., and in Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy*, pp. 90–93.

<sup>46</sup> Cf. especially, Audet, *op. cit.*, p. 382.

<sup>47</sup> K. Kohler, “*Didascalia*,” *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, IV, pp. 593–94; also his later article, “The Origin and Composition of the Eighteen Benedictions with a Translation of the Corresponding Essene Prayers in the Apostolic Constitutions,” *Hebrew Union College Annual*, I (Cincinnati, 1924), pp. 387–425.

speaking synagogue of the *Amida* for Sabbaths and festivals. The reworkings of the first three and the last three of the Eighteen Benedictions are evident there for all to see. Bousset,<sup>48</sup> Baumstark,<sup>49</sup> and Goodenough<sup>50</sup> have in turn made illuminating studies of these prayers, in both their Semitic roots and their Hellenistic relation of thought, though the thesis of Goodenough that they form a liturgy of "mystic" Judaism is doubtless overly bold. Bousset provided good grounds for dating the formulation of these prayers in the second century A.D. And there is no good reason to suppose that they were composed in Alexandria rather than in Antioch. I would myself posit the supposition that the compiler of the *Apostolic Constitutions* was himself directly responsible for the Christian interpolations in them, and that he drew this collection of synagogue prayers immediately from his own Antiochene environment. It is interesting, at least, to note that he placed them in his work at the end of the book which he devoted to his expansions of the *Didache*.

A more significant parallel to the *Didache* formularies is provided by the antique core of thanksgivings embedded in the Syriac Anaphora of SS. Addai and Mari, still in use in the liturgy of the Nestorians. The history of this ancient rite of the church of Edessa takes us behind the period of the schism of the Nestorians to the age of the great doctors—Diodore, Theodore, and Nestorius himself—whom the Nestorian churches look upon as their Fathers. All three of these men were Antiochenes, and we may legitimately suppose that it was through their influence, whether directly or indirectly, that the rite of Edessa took on certain features of the Antiochene rite of the late fourth and early fifth centuries, such as the Preface and *Sanctus* and the *Epiclesis*. We owe to Professor E. C. Ratcliff, however, the disengagement from the Nestorians' Anaphora of a primitive *eucharistia* that has the hallmark of an Ante-Nicene character.<sup>51</sup> Dom Gregory Dix went so far as to suppose that it might "well be connected originally with the second-century rite of Antioch, whence Edessa had received the faith."<sup>52</sup>

Be that as it may, there is one paragraph in this primitive Anaphora that is remarkably similar both in structure and thought to the table prayers of the *Didache*. It reads:

We give thanks to thee, O my Lord . . . for that thou hast given us great grace past recompense in that thou didst put on our manhood that thou mightest quicken it by thy godhead, and hast exalted our low estate and restored our fall and raised our mortality and forgiven our trespasses and

<sup>48</sup> W. Bousset, "Eine jüdische Gebetssammlung im siebenten Buch der apostolischen Konstitutionen," *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*, Phil.-hist. Kl. (1915), pp. 435–89.

<sup>49</sup> A. Baumstark, "Das eucharistische Hochgebet und die Literatur des nachexilischen Judentums," *Theologie und Glaube*, II (1910), pp. 353–70; cf. *Liturgie comparée*, pp. 12–13.

<sup>50</sup> E. R. Goodenough, *By Light, Light, The Mystic Gospel of Hellenistic Judaism* (New Haven, 1935), pp. 306–58.

<sup>51</sup> "The Original Form of the Anaphora of Addai and Mari: A Suggestion," *The Journal of Theological Studies*, XXX (1928), pp. 23–32. Cf. also B. Botte, "L'Anaphore Chaldéenne des Apôtres," *Orientalia christiana periodica*, XV (1949), pp. 259–76.

<sup>52</sup> *The Shape of the Liturgy*, p. 177.

justified our sinfulness and enlightened our knowledge. . . . And for all thine helps and graces towards us let us raise to thee praise and honour and confession and worship now and ever and world without end.<sup>53</sup>

Here is the same Jewish *beracha* form of address of blessing, relative clause of *anamnesis*, and concluding doxology, and also the similar ideas of Hellenistic Christian thought, as are found in the *Didache*.

We may reasonably conclude, therefore, from such evidence that the most primitive liturgical tradition of Syria, in so far as it is recoverable and recognizable in its genetic relation to the Semitic forms of its Jewish inheritance, survived in the churches of the hinterland. It probably showed marks of Hellenistic influence from the beginning. Yet it was not completely overwhelmed by Greek thought-patterns and style, for it ultimately found incorporation in the rites of the Nestorians of East Syria and Persia, when these Christians broke away from their Greek connections and reverted to Syriac for the language of their liturgy.

We cannot say the same, however, for the liturgy of the great church of Antioch itself. For if the evidence of the liturgical style of the Greek-speaking synagogues of the Jewish dispersion provides any clue—and it is admittedly slender in scope—we must reckon with a more definitely Hellenistic influence. The rather simple structure of the Jewish *beracha* has here developed into a lengthier, more rhetorical, and, shall we say, more philosophical cast. The *anamneses* of the wondrous works of God have become elaborated. The themes of creation, providence, and redemption have been expanded with a kind of oratorical flourish; and words drawn from the current philosophical eclecticism, on the margins of Stoicism and Platonism, have found their way into the texts. At the same time, a larger scope is given to frequent Biblical citations and allusions from the Septuagint. So much may be judged from the second-century collection of Jewish prayers in the Greek style included in the *Apostolic Constitutions*. An excellent example of the same phenomenon is provided by the great prayer of the First Epistle of Clement, composed at Rome towards the end of the first century (I Clem. 59–61). We should seriously doubt if the church of Antioch lagged in any way behind the church of Rome in this respect.

For this reason, I should very much doubt the hypothesis of Dom Dix that the more Semitic type of thanksgivings embedded in the Liturgy of SS. Addai and Mari represents in any way the second-century rite of Antioch. In this connection, attention should be called to the suggestion of Professor R. M. Grant that the passages on the works of God in creation and providence developed by Bishop Theophilus of Antioch in the first book of his apology *To Autolycus* echo a Eucharistic preface. There are numerous verbal similarities in them to the later Preface of the Apostolic Constitutions rite.<sup>54</sup> The passages have remarkable similarities in style and content with two paragraphs in First Clement, which many scholars have likewise noted as a possible reflection of a

<sup>53</sup> Text in Brightman, *op. cit.*, p. 285.

<sup>54</sup> "The Early Antiochene Anaphora," *Anglican Theological Review*, XXX (1948), pp. 91–94.

Eucharistic preface. In both First Clement and Theophilus the theme of God's creation and providence is solidly based upon Biblical reminiscences from Job and the Psalms, but the expression has a rhetorical flavor and a distinctly Stoic coloration.<sup>55</sup>

Unfortunately, we cannot penetrate further than these hints into the Ante-Nicene liturgy of Antioch. For the documentation surviving from the third century is even more scanty. The *Didascalia* outlines the external aspects of a typical Sunday assembly of the faithful for worship, but it provides no clue to the type of liturgy in use.<sup>56</sup> In any case, this "church-order" was probably not concerned with the church of Antioch, but with the lesser churches of the hinterland. We do catch a fleeting glimpse of liturgical reformation, with increasing outward splendor, if we read between the lines of gossip and misrepresentation in the encyclical of the bishops who condemned Paul of Samosata.<sup>57</sup>

That Paul was an innovator is certain. Whether he built or inherited the church building whose possession he held in his control until forced out by Aurelian, we cannot say. I am inclined to believe that he either acquired it or built it, and that this church was the *Palaea*, or "Old Church," later destroyed in the Diocletian persecution, but rebuilt immediately after the Constantinian peace.<sup>58</sup> Its rank as the cathedral was then supplanted, however, by the great Octagonal Church initiated by Constantine's munificence. But the "Old Church" had by no means seen its day in the traditions of Antioch. There the orthodox partisans of Bishop Meletios were later to assemble, those who could not endure the Arian Bishop Euzoios.<sup>59</sup> In this church, therefore, Paul of Samosata had scandalized his enemies by erecting a "lofty throne and *bema*," from which he preached with theatrical mannerisms to the noisy applause of his hearers. Perhaps we have here the origin of that peculiar arrangement which recent archaeological research has shown to be characteristic of Syrian churches—the raised episcopal throne, presbytery, and ambo, set in the midst of the nave rather than behind the altar in the sanctuary.<sup>60</sup>

Paul also reformed the chant at Antioch. He is said to have forbidden the use of "psalms addressed to our Lord Jesus Christ, as being modern and composed by modern men, but trained women to sing psalms in his own honor on the great day of the Pascha." What this charge really says is that Paul allowed no hymnody at the liturgy except the Biblical psalms and canticles, with the only relaxation of the rule on Easter Day. Of course, this regulation was in line with Paul's preferences for a Biblical literalism, as opposed to the more fanciful flights of allegorical exegesis. But it went deeper than this. Whatever the

<sup>55</sup> See the note and references of G. Bardy, *Théophile d'Antioche, Trois Livres à Autolycus*, Sources chrétiennes, 20 (Paris, 1948), p. 71.

<sup>56</sup> Chap. xii (ed. R. H. Connolly, pp. 119-24).

<sup>57</sup> Eusebius, *H.E.*, vii. 30.

<sup>58</sup> Theodoret, *H.E.*, i. 2.

<sup>59</sup> *Ibid.*, iii. 2.

<sup>60</sup> J. Lassus, *Sanctuaires chrétiens de Syrie* (Paris, 1947), pp. 207-12; G. Tchalenko, *Villages antiques de la Syrie du Nord. Le massif du Bélus à l'époque romaine*, I (Paris, 1953), *passim*, especially p. 328. An interesting study of Paul's throne, but without archaeological reference, is E. Stommel, "Bischofsstuhl und Hoher Thron," *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum*, I (Münster Westfalen, 1958), pp. 52-78.

failings in Paul's own Christology, he seems to have sensed the dangers to a sound Biblical theology by the free use of "modern" hymns. For in all periods of the Church's history, the theology of the people has been chiefly molded by their hymns. If Paul needed any justification for his policy, he might well have pointed to past experience with the Gnostics and their hymns.<sup>61</sup> Later generations learned the lesson again, in combatting the influence of the hymns of the Arians. With this background we understand the importance of the introduction at Antioch, during the Arianizing episcopate of Leontius, of antiphonal psalmody by Diodore and Flavian.<sup>62</sup>

After Paul of Samosata, we have no traces of liturgical developments at Antioch until the latter part of the fourth century, when the rites of the church have achieved a mature and almost definitive formulation. The sources are relatively copious, as compared with other sees at the same period. But liturgical scholarship has suffered from a failure to arrive at consensus for two reasons. One is a fault in methodology. It has been all too common to take the so-called "Clementine" liturgy of the eighth book of the *Apostolic Constitutions* as a norm. Even so careful a critic as Hans Lietzmann considered this bookish liturgy to be a living rite.<sup>63</sup> Yet all that we know about the Constitutor's methods would suggest that his liturgy was an ideal construction, according to his own taste. Structurally, it does follow the outline of the Antiochene liturgy of his day, though there are minor discrepancies between his outline in Book II and that in Book VIII.<sup>64</sup> But his texts are a conflation, with his own expansions, from several sources.

A sound methodology must begin with the notices of the Antiochene liturgy that are scattered throughout the sermons of John Chrysostom,<sup>65</sup> and those that are recounted in the catechetical homilies of Theodore of Mopsuestia.<sup>66</sup> As unsatisfactory as these may be, because of the tendency of the preacher to summarize and paraphrase rather than to quote actual forms, they nonetheless

<sup>61</sup> In replacing hymns with Biblical Psalms, Paul was acting in line with a general tendency in third-century Christian worship. Cf. B. Fischer, *Die Psalmenfrömmigkeit der Märtyrerkirche* (Freiburg, 1949), p. 3.

<sup>62</sup> Theodoret, *H.E.*, ii. 19. Cf. *supra*, note 25.

<sup>63</sup> *Messe und Herrenmahl, Eine Studie zur Geschichte der Liturgie*, Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte, 8 (Bonn, 1926), p. 133.

<sup>64</sup> Notably in the sequence of ceremonies and prayers before and after the Offertory. These differences may well be due to the use of variant sources.

<sup>65</sup> The material is conveniently collected in Brightman, *op. cit.*, pp. 475-81.

<sup>66</sup> First published with English translation by A. Mingana, *Woodbrooke Studies*, VI (Cambridge, 1933); a Latin version by A. Rücker, *Ritus baptismi et missae quem descriptis Theodorus ep. Mopsuestenus in sermonibus catechetis, etc.* (Münster, 1933). The best edition, with a photographic reproduction of the Syriac manuscript and a French translation, is that of R. Tonneau and R. Devreesse, *Les homélies catéchétiques de Théodore de Mopsueste*, *Studi e testi*, 145 (Vatican City, 1949).

Excellent comparative studies of Theodore's liturgy will be found in H. Lietzmann, "Die Liturgie des Theodor von Mopsuestia," *Sitzungsberichte der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Phil.-hist. Kl., XXIII (1933), pp. 915-36; and F. J. Reine, *The Eucharistic Doctrine and Liturgy of the Mystagogical Catecheses of Theodore of Mopsuestia* (Washington, 1942).

A useful introduction to the present state of research in the Syrian liturgies is A. Raes, "L'étude de la liturgie Syrienne: son état actuel," *Miscellanea liturgica in honorem L. Cuniberti Mohlberg*, I (Rome, 1948), pp. 333-46. In addition to the texts collected by Brightman, *op. cit.*, an indispensable manual for the study of all Eastern rites is Hanssens, *op. cit.* An excellent bibliography is available in Baumstark, *Liturgie comparée*, p. 237 ff.

provide a fairly clear indication of what the celebrant commemorated in the most solemn prayers. Only then can we test the suggested forms of the *Apostolic Constitutions* and note its adaptations and expansions.

Secondly, the problem of reconstructing the late fourth-century Antiochene rite involves the more delicate, and as yet insoluble, question of the evolutionary history of the Liturgy of St. James. This liturgy, which is the old rite of the church of Jerusalem and a close relative of the rite of Antioch, became in the course of time the generally favored rite of the Antiochene patriarchate. As such, it survives as the principal rite of the Syrian Jacobites. Its Greek version, however, was finally supplanted, among the Orthodox churches of the patriarchate, by the Byzantine liturgy, which is itself another close cousin of the old rite of Antioch. The problem is one of determining: 1. what elements in the St. James Liturgy are original and distinctive; 2. what elements are originally parallel to the rite of Antioch; and 3. what elements are borrowed from the rite of Antioch when the St. James Liturgy becomes the rite of the patriarchate. As yet there is no agreement on these questions.<sup>67</sup> But in any case, one must begin with the "pure" Antiochene sources that can be detected in Chrysostom and Theodore.

A comparison of Chrysostom and Theodore's summaries of the Antiochene Anaphora reveals a basic outline as follows:

1. A Preface of praise to God the Holy Trinity, in which the earthly Church joins with the heavenly hosts in hymning the *Sanctus*;
2. A Post-*Sanctus* recital of the *memorabilia* of God, His wondrous works in the creation of man, and the dispensations of His providence in respect to the fall of man—by the giving of the Law, the sending of the prophets, and finally in the Incarnation, passion, and resurrection of His Son;—to which is included a recalling of the institution of the Eucharist at the Last Supper;
3. An *Epiclesis* or Invocation of the Holy Spirit for the specific consecration of the offered gifts of bread and wine as the Body and Blood of Christ, with supplication for the worthy benefits to those who communicate;
4. An Intercession for the peace and welfare of the Church in all its members, both living and dead.

The differences between Chrysostom and Theodore are chiefly matters of emphasis. Chrysostom, quite characteristically, stresses the moral implications of the redemptive activity of God. Theodore is more interested in the theological problems of the relations of the Persons of the Godhead, and the divine-human union of natures in Christ. Both of them accent the Invocation as the high point of the Anaphora. For Chrysostom, the falling of the Holy Spirit upon the oblations sets them on fire; for Theodore, His grace makes them manifest and visible food of immortal nourishment.

<sup>67</sup> The most recent analyses are those of Lietzmann, *op. cit., passim*; and Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy*, pp. 196-207.

The rite of the *Apostolic Constitutions* follows the same basic outline, with but one exception. The dispensation of God in creation, and in the Law and the prophets, is spelled out in detail in the Preface to the *Sanctus*. But it can be shown, I believe, that this whole section of the rite of the Constitutor is borrowed from a Jewish source and inserted *ad hoc*.<sup>68</sup> His Post-*Sanctus* is clearly similar to that described by Chrysostom and Theodore; and much of its text is based upon the form in the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus.<sup>69</sup> The peculiarity of the *Apostolic Constitutions* liturgy, apart from its excessive length, lies in its Arianizing exposition of the relations of the Triune Godhead,<sup>70</sup> and in its artificial expansion of the Preface, so as to make the *Sanctus* a dividing point between the Old and the New Testament recitals.

The Liturgy of St. James similarly follows the same outline. Its difference lies in certain Biblical citations that are peculiar to it in the Preface, *Anamnesis*, and Invocation. Many of these Biblical citations are designed to call attention to local reminiscences or shrines in the holy city.<sup>71</sup> It is possible, however, that the Post-*Sanctus* recital of the dispensations of God in the Law, prophets, and Incarnation, is not original. They are lacking in the exposition of the Jerusalemite liturgy in the catechetical lectures ascribed to Cyril (or perhaps, to his successor John).<sup>72</sup> It may be that this section of the Anaphora of St. James was added after the Jerusalem liturgy was adopted as the patriarchal rite of Antioch. Certainty on this point is as yet not established.

When we turn to the Byzantine rites, we must distinguish between the Liturgy of St. Basil and the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom, respectively. The former probably goes back to St. Basil himself,<sup>73</sup> and rests upon the fourth-century rite of Caesarea in Cappadocia. Its outline is exactly comparable to that of the liturgy of Antioch as just described. We must remember that in Basil's time, the see of Caesarea in Cappadocia was still part of Antioch's, not of Constantinople's patriarchal oversight. We do not know who introduced Basil's liturgy at the capital. It may have been Gregory of Nazianzen, or it may have been adopted at a later time through monastic influence.<sup>74</sup> But the Liturgy of

<sup>68</sup> This was demonstrated by Bousset, *op. cit.*; but for a contrary opinion, cf. Lietzmann, *op. cit.*, p. 125 ff. The error of Lietzmann is his failure to recognize that the first part of the Preface of *Apostolic Constitutions*, by its similarity with the prayer for the consecration of a bishop, is related to the *Apostolic Tradition*, and not derived directly from a Jewish source.

<sup>69</sup> The parallels are almost entirely confined to the Post-*Sanctus*. The only reflection of Hippolytus in the Preface is the citation of Isa. 9:5, LXX ("angel of great counsel").

<sup>70</sup> Cf. C. H. Turner, "Notes on the Apostolic Constitutions," *The Journal of Theological Studies*, XVI (1914), pp. 54-61, where the readings of the best MS (Vat. gr. 1506) betray more markedly Arianizing tendencies than might be suspected from the received text as published by Brightman and others.

<sup>71</sup> Cf. references to the heavenly Jerusalem in the Preface (Heb. 12:22-23) and *Anamnesis* (1 Cor. 2:9), and to the descent of the Spirit at Pentecost in the upper room of the church of Sion, in the Invocation.

<sup>72</sup> Cogent reasons for ascribing the mystagogical lectures of the *Catecheses* to John of Jerusalem were presented by W. J. Swaans, "A propos des 'Catéchèses Mystagogiques' attribuées à S. Cyrille de Jérusalem," *Le muséon*, LV (1942), pp. 1-43. In a study which I hope to publish soon, I have attempted to analyse the Anaphora described in these lectures and its reflection in various writings of Eusebius of Caesarea.

<sup>73</sup> See P. de Meester, "Grecques (Liturgies)," *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie*, VI, col. 1604. Cf. H. Engberding, *Das eucharistische Hochgebet der Basiliosliturgie* (Münster in W., 1931). (Of this work, I have seen only the abstract published as an Inaugural-Dissertation).

<sup>74</sup> The pertinent literature, ancient and modern, is given in Hanssens, *op. cit.*, III, p. 576 ff.

St. Basil is unmistakably an Antiochene type of rite. Its single peculiarity is its mosaic of Biblical vocabulary—a feature quite in line with Basil's own style and interest.

The Liturgy of St. Chrysostom presents more complicated problems. It is certainly not by Chrysostom himself. Nor can it be proved that it is a synopsis of the Liturgy of St. Basil. It has certain characteristic marks that relate it definitely to the Syrian, rather than to the Egyptian type of rite. But unlike the Antiochene liturgies, it places the reference to man's creation and fall in the *Pre-Sanctus*, not in the *Post-Sanctus*. Any theory as to its origin can only, in the present state of our knowledge, be purely speculative.<sup>75</sup>

The Nestorians have preserved two Anaphorae, in addition to their more normative one of SS. Addai and Mari, that are attributed to Theodore of Mopsuestia and to Nestorius, respectively. The one ascribed to Theodore was thought by Dr. Brightman to be an authentic composition of its supposed author.<sup>76</sup> But the discovery of Theodore's catechetical homilies has shown that this hypothesis is not likely. The outline of the Anaphora is distinctly Antiochene, and there are marked points of contact with the Anaphora of SS. Addai and Mari.<sup>77</sup> The Anaphora of Nestorius can easily be shown to be a patch-work affair, combining the Anaphora ascribed to Theodore with elements drawn from the Byzantine rites. The only differences between these two Anaphorae and those of the Antiochene type, so far as their basic structure is concerned, is that the Nestorian ones place the Intercession before the Invocation. This difference must at least antedate the time of Narsai of Nisibis (d. 502).<sup>78</sup>

Finally, without pausing to analyse details, one should note the influence of the Antiochene liturgy in provinces farther afield. The Armenian liturgy has a distinctly Antiochene core, but it has been much modified by borrowings from Jerusalem and Constantinople, and, at a much later time, by bits and pieces derived from the West through the Crusaders. The Egyptian liturgies, both in the Greek and the Coptic traditions, have also not escaped a Syrianizing expansion. These have come from two directions: the Palestinian Liturgy of St. James and the Byzantine Liturgy of St. Basil.<sup>79</sup> Basically, the rite of Alexandria is sufficiently distinctive, so that its original core can be easily detected. It is less Biblical and historical, more theological and "gnostic" than the Antiochene. Its structural order is quite different, especially in the placing of the Invocation.<sup>80</sup> How it came to be Syrianized at so early a time—that is,

<sup>75</sup> De Meester, *op. cit.*, cols. 1600–04; Hanssens, *op. cit.*, p. 578 ff.

<sup>76</sup> F. E. Brightman, "The Anaphora of Theodore," *The Journal of Theological Studies*, XXXI (1930), 160–64.

<sup>77</sup> B. Botte, "L'anaphore chaldéenne des apôtres," *Orientalia christiana periodica*, XV (1949), pp. 259–76. See also the same author's article cited in note 78.

<sup>78</sup> R. H. Connolly, *The Liturgical Homilies of Narsai*, Texts and Studies, VIII, no. 1 (Cambridge, 1909), especially pages lvi–lvii. Dom B. Botte believes that the Invocation, though ancient in the East Syrian liturgies, is not original in them; see his suggestive article, "L'épiclèse dans les liturgies syriennes orientales," *Sacris Erudiri*, VI (1954), pp. 48–72.

<sup>79</sup> The Alexandrian borrowings are clearly revealed in the several analyses of Lietzmann, *op. cit.*

<sup>80</sup> The Alexandrian characteristics are brought out most clearly in the discussion of Sarapion's *Sacramentary* by Lietzmann, *op. cit.*, pp. 186–97; and by B. Capelle, "L'anaphore de Sérapion. Essai d'exégèse," *Le muséon*, LIX (1946), pp. 425–43.

before the Monophysite schism (since its Greek and Coptic versions exhibit similar Syrian features)—remains as yet to be demonstrated. It is possible that the clue may be found in the monastic sphere, in the tremendous prestige of the work of St. Basil.<sup>81</sup>

## IV

We have confined our attention almost exclusively to the Eucharistic rite, for it is this liturgy specifically that exhibits the widest influence of the Antiochene tradition. More study needs to be given to the question whether the consecratory *Epiclesis*, which is so characteristic of the Syrian type of liturgy, had its origins and shaping in Antioch. The problem is complicated by several unknown factors. One has to do with the possible roots in Gnosticism of forms of invocation for the descent upon the sacramental elements of a divine, impregnating power.<sup>82</sup> Another problem concerns the original text of the Invocation in Hippolytus, since the extant Latin version is grammatically obscure as it now stands. Dom Dix was an ardent advocate of the thesis that the *Epiclesis* in Hippolytus' rite had undergone expansion in the fourth century—and that, too, at the hands of his supposed Syrian compiler of the "church order" materials contained in the Verona palimpsest.<sup>83</sup> Other eminent liturgiologists as strongly contest Dom Dix's hypothesis.<sup>84</sup>

A third factor is the sudden appearance in the *Catechetical Lectures* ascribed to Cyril of Jerusalem of the first definitive form of a consecrating Invocation.<sup>85</sup> There are traces of Egyptian influences on the fourth-century liturgy of Jerusalem. But the oldest Invocation forms in the Egyptian rites are quite different in style and implication from the form quoted by Cyril.<sup>86</sup> The question remains therefore whether the Jerusalem rite is responsible for the development of the Syrian type of *Epiclesis*, or whether Jerusalem borrowed it from an Antiochene or otherwise Syrian source.

One reason why I am myself skeptical of Dom Dix's theory about the Hippolytean *Epiclesis* is the circumstance that his so-called Syrian compiler refrained from any adaptation of the initiatory rites of Baptism and Confirmation so as to bring them into conformity with Syrian custom. Yet this is exactly what the Syrian compiler of the *Apostolic Constitutions* did with his sources. In the seventh book, based on the *Didache*, the Constitutor reshaped the directives for Christian initiation to conform them to Syrian usage; and in

<sup>81</sup> One should note the critique of Engberding's theories by Hanssens, *op. cit.*, p. 578.

<sup>82</sup> The word *epiclesis* is first used by Irenaeus, both with respect to the Valentinian Gnostic Marcus (*Adv. haer.* i. 13, 2), and to Catholic usage (iv. 18, 5). The origins of the *Epiclesis* have been much debated. See the summary of views in O. Casel, "Zur Epikiese," *Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft*, III (1923), pp. 100–02; "Neue Beiträge zur Epiklesenfrage," *ibid.*, IV (1924), pp. 169–78; F. L. Cirlot, *The Early Eucharist* (London, 1939), pp. 58–74, 192–221 (on the Gnostics, especially pp. 213–21). See *supra*, note 25.

<sup>83</sup> G. Dix, "The Origins of the Epiclesis," *Theology*, XXVIII (1934), pp. 125–37, 187–202; "The Epiclesis: Some Considerations," *ibid.*, XXIX (1934), pp. 287–94; *The Apostolic Tradition*, pp. 75–79.

<sup>84</sup> See *supra*, note 8.

<sup>85</sup> *Cat. Myst.*, v. 7.

<sup>86</sup> Texts in Lietzmann, *op. cit.*, pp. 68–81.

the eighth book, which is based on Hippolytus' *Apostolic Tradition*, the entire section on Baptism and Confirmation is omitted.<sup>87</sup> He passes at once from the instructions about catechumens to the outline of the festivals of the Church Year.

It has long been recognized that the Syrian Church's initiatory rites were distinctive from those of all other churches in that they placed Confirmation (*i.e.*, the anointing with Chrism) before rather than after Baptism. This peculiarity of Syria has hitherto been attested chiefly by the Church Orders and the Syrian liturgies themselves. At Jerusalem, however, the rite described by Cyril places the Confirmation after Baptism, as in other liturgical traditions. The discovery of the *Catechetical Lectures* of Theodore of Mopsuestia did not provide a decisive attestation of the Syrian practice, since Theodore's rite had two anointings, one before and one after Baptism, though it is evident from his treatment that the one before Baptism was the more significant.<sup>88</sup>

We are now in the favorable position of being able to support the Syrian usage of Confirmation prior to Baptism from a source of impeccable authority—namely, the eight catechetical, baptismal homilies recently discovered by Antoine Wenger in a manuscript of Chrysostom's works in the library of the monastery of Stavronikita on Mount Athos.<sup>89</sup> These homilies, when compared with others of Chrysostom that have been published hitherto, though not always easily accessible, provide not only clear testimony to the Syrian initiatory custom, but show that it was characteristic of the Greek church of Antioch in particular. M. Wenger, on other grounds, has given sufficient evidence that these sermons were preached by Chrysostom in Antioch, and not in Constantinople, and that they were probably delivered about the year 390.<sup>90</sup> It is the more surprising that he has not realized the liturgical significance of his important find, for he speaks of a "serious difficulty" in the fact that Chrysostom does not mention "the consignation after Baptism, in which Catholic theology sees today the sacrament of Confirmation."<sup>91</sup> But there is no difficulty. He has been misled by trying to relate Chrysostom's Antiochene rite with that of Jerusalem on the one hand, and with that of Constantinople on the other. The fact is that at Antioch the rite of Confirmation preceded Baptism, as Chrysostom's homilies clearly attest. We are thus fortunate, through this significant discovery, in being able to support the testimony of the Syrian Church Orders with the evidence of John Chrysostom.

If one asks why the Syrian Church alone maintained the peculiarity of Confirmation prior to Baptism, we can only offer speculative hypotheses. The usage seems to be original and to stem from apostolic times. Dom Gregory Dix has offered an explanation which to date has the greatest degree of plausi-

<sup>87</sup> Cf. *Apost. Const.*, vii. 22 with *Didache* 7; *Apost. Const.*, viii. 32 with Hippolytus, *Apost. Trad.*, 16-23.

<sup>88</sup> Cf. the summaries at the beginning of Homilies XIII and XIV (edition of Tonneau and Devreesse, pp. 367-69, 401-03).

<sup>89</sup> Cited *supra*, note 42.

<sup>90</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 63-65.

<sup>91</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 99.

bility. He believes the Syrian order of Confirmation-Baptism-Communion to be a Christian counterpart to the Jewish order of proselyte initiation by Circumcision-Baptism-Sacrifice. This "Semitic" sequence was preserved in Syria; but in the other Gentile churches a more rational, and hence a more "Greek" order was established, whereby the candidate was first cleansed in the water of Baptism and only then made suitable for the indwelling of the Holy Spirit imparted in Confirmation.<sup>92</sup>

Unfortunately, Dix's theory is interlocked with his theological views regarding the respective graces conferred in Baptism and Confirmation. His theology of Christian initiation has been cogently criticized by Professor G. W. H. Lampe, who in turn believes that the Syrian order of Confirmation prior to Baptism originated in the second century with the Gnostics.<sup>93</sup> We shall not debate the matter here. Suffice it to say that the Book of Acts—and, as Dr. T. W. Manson has tried to show, the Johannine Epistles also<sup>94</sup>—provide certain evidence for a pre-Gnostic, indeed for an apostolic tradition that knew of a pre-baptismal bestowal of the Spirit.

Whatever may be the final resolution of these debatable liturgical questions they bring before us in this particular sphere of research the same centering of our attention upon the crucial role of the church in Antioch, to which so many other areas of investigation in Christian origins lead us. For Antioch was the bridge over which early Christianity passed from one world of culture to another, from the Jew to the Gentile, from the Semite to the Greek. Doubtless there were Hellenistic elements in the Church from its very first days in Jerusalem. There is much promise of new insight into this phenomenon in the studies of primitive Jewish Christianity stimulated by the discoveries of Qumran and all that they offer for enlarging our perspective upon the varieties of cultic and doctrinal elements that lay in the immediate background of Jesus and the first disciples of The Way. But it was at Antioch that the movement launched in Judaea and Galilee first became distinguishable outwardly as a new religion and received the name Christian. And in their consciousness of being a new religion, the Christians of Antioch were perhaps the first to make explicit the emergence of a new way of worship.

In one of the fragments of an early second-century apology, *The Preaching of Peter*, a document quite possibly written at Antioch, there is a passage that puts the matter thus:

This God worship ye, not after the manner of the Greeks, . . . neither worship ye Him as do the Jews . . . but worship God in a new way through Christ. For we have found in the Scriptures how the Lord says: "Behold, I

<sup>92</sup> *Confirmation or the Laying on of Hands?*, Theology Occasional Papers, 5 (1936); "The 'Seal' in the Second Century," *Theology*, LI (1948), pp. 7-12.

<sup>93</sup> *The Seal of the Spirit* (London, 1951), p. 90. For the Gnostic usage, see also E. C. Ratcliff, "The Relation of Confirmation to Baptism in the Early Roman and Byzantine Liturgies," *Theology*, XLIX (1946), pp. 258-65, 290-95.

<sup>94</sup> "Entry into Membership of the Early Church," *The Journal of Theological Studies*, XLVIII (1947), pp. 25-33. On the whole subject, one may usefully consult the comments of Dom R. H. Connolly, *The Liturgical Homilies of Narsai*, p. xliff.

make with you a New Covenant, not as the covenant with your fathers in Mount Horeb." He has made a new one with us. For the ways of the Greeks and the Jews are old, but we are they who worship Him in a new way, as a third people, namely, Christians.<sup>95</sup>

CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL OF THE PACIFIC  
Berkeley, California

<sup>95</sup> In Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata*, vi. 5.